



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IV.—LATIN GLOSSES.

Forms like *drachuma*, *Tecumessa*, *mina*, *techina* in Old Latin, as against *δραχμή*, *Τέκμησσα*, *μνᾶ*, *τέχνη* in Greek, show that there was a shunning of certain consonant combinations in the older stages of Latin, a peculiarity which gave rise to the development of parasitical vowels, called anaptyxis by the grammarians. It seems that this habit of inserting such vowels was successfully battled with in the schools, and gradually disappeared from the speech of the educated. But that it still must have lingered among the masses, of that the old glossaries offer sufficient evidence. So we find by the side of *technis*, C. Gloss. Lat. V 581, 20, the old Plautine form *techinis* (corrupted to *tethinis*), IV 183, 32; *techinam* (corrupted to *temnam* from *tehinam*), IV 183, 3, which reappears as *thecinam* by metathesis, V 156, 18. Greek *κύκνος* must have been current in popular speech as *cicinus*, for V 471, 40 we read *olor cygnus idest cicinus*, and V 471, 41 *olores cygni cicini*. With that compare V 178, 11 *cilipsidra* = *κλεψιδρα*. V 382, 58 *progene* = *Πρόκηνη*; 320, 60 *phalanox* = *φάλαγξ*; 483, 23 *setemmata* = *στέμματα*; 275, 21 *caseleo* = Hebrew *casleo*; 541, 13 *balax* = *βλάξ*; 150, 31 *sisimus* = *σεισμός*. IV 134, 8. 32 *origia* = *ὄργια*; 109, 33 *linix* = *λίγξ*; 143, 19 *pisimitio* = *ψιμυθίω*; 553, 24 *pisiatium* = *ψιάθιον*; 145, 14 *pleturum* = *πλήκτρον*; 530, 32 *arripennem* = Celtic-French *arpen*; 513, 42 *enocilius* = *ἐγγέλως*. III 397, 32 *pelarigos* = *πελαργός*, 16 *patellea* = *πτελέα*; 571, 23 *obitalimus* = *ὀφθαλμός*; 142, 61 *zimigma* = *σμίγμα*. V 513, 32 *segmina* = *σμίγμα*. Wright-Wülker 370, 2 *calamidis* = *χλαμύδος*.

According to Lindsay, *The Latin Language*, p. 145 ff., we find also in native Latin words a tendency to develop such a parasitical vowel: witness *uehiculum* for the older *uehiclum*, where *clu-* stands for the Indo-Germanic suffix *-tlo-*, denoting instrument. Along that line we meet in the glossaries with forms as IV 126, 5 *nomenculator* for *nomenclator*; 140, 21 *perculatus*, that is *perculacus* from *perculusus*, for *perculusus* 140, 35. 36; 141, 10; 182, 9 *tegimine* for *tegmīne*; 189, 37 *ueemeris*, that is *ueemenis*, for *uehemens*; 399, 49 *uasita* for *uasta[ta]*; 402, 1 *uirecita* for *uirecta*; 465, 53 *superestes* for *superstes*; 577, 7 *uafero* for *uafro*;

521, 32 *ganarus* for *gnarus*; 513, 18 *mores* for *mors*; 492, 40 *calex* for *calx*; 579, 9 *uiriculis*, that is *uirigulis*, for *uirgulis*; 547, 44 *parimula* for *parmula*. IV 605, 23 *dulicia* for *dulcia*. V 309, 51 *apericolarius* for *apercularius*; 331, 27 *arimorum* for *armorum*; 370, 47 *terans*, 536, 67 *tarans*, for *trans*; 393, 34 *soleris* for *sollers*; 536, 12 *ineritia* for *inertia*; 537, 30 *clamite* for *clam te*; 506, 42 *lorigo*, that is *lorico*, for *lurco*; 612, 11 *carpitum* for *carptim*; 633, 26 *celeppere* for *clepere*. W.-W. 274, 18 *arimentum* for *armentum*; 274, 17 *arimentarius* for *armentarius*; 356, 3 *achariter* for *acriter*.

Lindsay speaks, p. 37, of a curious tendency to interchange *u—i* or *i—u*, as apparent in Vulgar Latin *stupila* for *stipula*, *Utica* for Ἰτύκη. Similar to that is when we find in the glossaries an interchange of *u—o*, as III 416, 40 *rubor* for *robur*; IV 213, 38 *pucoli* for *poculi*; or interchange of *a—u*, as in IV 361, 53 *lucana* for *lacuna*; and of *a—u*, IV 549, 40 *iugala*, that is *iucala*, for *iacula*; or interchange of *e—i*, as IV 273, 25 *criscet* for *crescit*; 361, 30 *liuegat* for *leuigat*; V 565, 2 *metri* for *mitre* = *mitrae*. Just so we find interchange of *e—u*, as in IV 556, 5 *tugellaria* for *teglaria*; and of *a—e* in IV 346, 22 *mela* for *male* = *malae*; V 274, 43 *laetantia* for *latentia*; likewise there is occasional interchange of *u—e*, as in V 512, 53 *reppudula* for *rubetula*. Probably an interchange of *i—a* we have in V 299, 42, where two glosses are confused. What there is now to be read *hareolus iocundus uel diuinus abaris* seems to have been originally *hilariolus* (found in Cicero's correspondence) *iocundus* (*h*)*areolus diuinus* [*dictus*] *ab aris*. Interchange of *i—o* we have IV 532, 2 *momitauri*, i. e. *monitauri*, for *minotauri*; of *o—a*, IV 251, 45 *interpalore* for *interpolare*. Owing to interchange of *oe—a* we find IV 355, 29 *penoe* for *poena*.

On a par with this vowel-interchange is the phenomenon of consonant-interchange which we observe in *litinices* for *liticines* IV 108, 25; *cedunt* for *decunt*, i. e. *tegunt*, IV 144, 3; *uitigilat* for *utiligat* IV 296, 40; *lapicidina* for *lapidicina* IV 253, 13, cf. 532, 20; V 215, 19. 306, 35. 370, 22; *casmonia* for *casnomia* (so in Corp. Gl. C. 149) = κώνωμνια¹; *laeta nogo* for *laena toga* IV 533, 8; *gerelem* for *galerum* IV 604, 10; *gaminidis* for *ganymidis*, i. e. *Ganymedis*, V 275, 3; *penucie* for *pecuniae* V 221, 15; *inriuisa* for *inrisiua* V 109, 17; *dilocus*, i. e. *d̄ilocus*, for *dyscolus* V 286, 37; *laguno* for *lanugo* V 306, 25; *orscitra* for *orcistra*,

¹ Or is it κυνόμνια?

i. e. *orchestra*, V 376, 22; *uetuli* for *ueluti* V 335, 35; *incelebrati* for *inlecebrati* V 139, 15; *inlecebrarum* for *incelebrem* V 301, 59; *garilum* for *galirum*, i. e. *galerum*, V 363, 49; *pulimio* for *pumilio* V 326, 9; *spiciones* for *scipiones* V 393, 12. 331, 20; *suspectur* for *susceptur*, i. e. *susceptor*, IV 284, 7; *dicit* for *cidit*, i. e. *cedit* = *caedit*,¹ V 385, 4; *priugilium* for *priuilegium* V 510, 64; *getura*, i. e. *gelura*, for *gerula* V 502, 30; *reminiculum*, i. e. *remidiculum*, for *redimiculum* V 479, 17; *senilis* for *selinis*, which we have V 244, 2, i. e. *Selinus* V 578, 56; *galinas* for *genialem* V 642, 5; *murrani*, i. e. *morani*, for *Romani* V 553, 40. That this phenomenon of metathesis as apparent in the above-quoted examples is worthy of our attention, I will just refer to Italian *panereccio* = Portuguese *panaricio* = Spanish *panarizo* = French *panaris*, forms that cannot be understood otherwise than as instances of metathesis of Greek *παρωνυχία*. At the same time this observation will enable us to understand some glosses that on the face of them are incomprehensible. For example, in IV 400, 22 *uena oculi cuniculi* it is tolerably clear that *uena* explained by *cuniculi* must mean a mineral vein or lode, but we are puzzled at *oculi* (which we meet again IV 191, 43 a). V 488, 51 the gloss appears in this form: *uena oculi cuniculi*. This *oculi* may lead us on the right track; for that may stand for *olucie*, i. e. *orugiae* = *arrugiae*. As to *l* for *r* cf. V 126, 9 *oleae* = *oreae*; 274, 33 *caros seruus* = *calo seruus*; 276, 22 *caerebri* = *celebri*. As to *c* appearing in the place of *g*, I need not quote any examples: it is of constant occurrence in these glosses. *A* for *o* we have V 245, 13 *calor* = *color*; IV 27, 22 *canum* = *conum*; IV 573, 50 *abscurus* = *obscurus*; IV 165, 38 *uelarum* = *uelorum*; IV 31, 1 = 28, 35 *callet usitatissima* (*h*)*abet* = *astutissime nouit*, as Landgraf correctly points out (Archiv f. L. L. IX³ 368).

A very difficult gloss is C. Gl. L. IV 65, 2 *ergata uicinus aut operator*; similar are IV 232, 45 *ergata uicinus uel operator*; 336, 45 *ergata operator*; 508, 43 *ergata uicinus aut operator*; V 290, 50 *ergata uicinus uel operatur g.*; 194, 21 *ergata uicinus aut operator*. Corpus Gloss. E 272 *ergata uicinis*. The word troubling us in these glosses is *uicinus*. Warron, in his edition of Sangallensis 912, tried to overcome the difficulty by assuming

¹ The full gloss reads $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \textit{percatapsat} \\ \textit{ualde dedit} \end{array} \right.$. It is evident that the first syllable of *dedit* is dittography of the last syllable of *ualde*. On *percatapsat* cf. Loewe, Prodrum, pp. 106 and 359.

that *uicinus* is = *ficinus* = **officinus* 'a man working in a shop,' but such a word-formation is, I should say, impossible: Warron, at least, has not adduced any proof of its possibility. I see in *uicinus* a corruption of *uicillus*; that is to say, of *uillicus* having been subjected to metathesis; for, that *uicinus* refers to a man occupied with agricultural work is seen from V 349, 17 *colonus uicinus*, wherewith compare IV 204, 48 *agricola colonus*.¹ All the above-quoted glosses refer, I think, to Genes. 4, 2, where the Codex Venetus has $\kappa\alpha\iota\upsilon\ \delta'\ \epsilon\pi\eta\rho\epsilon\epsilon\ \epsilon\rho\gamma\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$. I conceive the original gloss to have been something like this: $\gamma\epsilon\omega\rho\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma\ :\ \epsilon\rho\gamma\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$ *uillicus operator*; this was abbreviated to $\epsilon\rho\gamma\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$ *uillicus operator*. Later on $\gamma\eta\varsigma$ dropped out, and then in Latin guise the gloss took the form of *ergata uillicus operator*. Then, after *uillicus*, through the operation of metathesis, had been transformed into *uicillus* and that corrupted to *uicinus*, an *aut* or *uel* was inserted to make the thing palatable. As to *uillicus operator* cf. III 495, 35 *georgus uillicus operarius*; III 512, 10 *georgus uillicus operarius*; III 300, 7 $\gamma\epsilon\omega\rho\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma$ *uillicus*; III 300, 8 $\gamma\epsilon\omega\rho\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma$ *operarius*; the last two apparently belong together and ought to read $\gamma\epsilon\omega\rho\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma$ *uillicus operarius*. Concerning *n* for *l* cf. V 316, 10 *cycli* = *cygni*.

In a similar way we may get at a proper understanding of IV 31, 16 *cauillatur mandatur*; IV 315, 10 *cabillator mandrator calumniator*. Corpus Glossary (ed. Hessels) C 248 *cabillatur mandrat*; the inverted gloss we find IV 363, 45 *mandrator cabillator*. Also what we read V 273, 48 *capillatur dragmatur* seems to belong here.² That *cabillatur*, *capillatur*, *cauillatur* stands for *caluitur* has already been pointed out by Landgraf, Archiv f. L. IX³ 369; but I hardly think he restored the original reading of IV 315, 10, when on the basis of V 274, 59 he proposed *caluitur moratur calumniatur*. *Calumniatur* certainly does not well fit in with *caluitur*, and it is difficult to see how an original *moratur* can be the parent of *mandratur*, *mandrat*, *mandatur*. It would rather seem more probable that IV 315, 10 is a confusion of two glosses, viz. *cauillatur calumniatur*³ and *caluitur manti-*

¹ Cf. also V 495, 68 *cultor operarius*, which is probably part of an original *agricola terrae cultor, operarius*.

² But that, perhaps, is rather *pugillos uel dragmata*.

³ Cf. IV 315, 11 *cabillator calumniam facit uel conuitionem iocatur*, i. e. *cauillatur calumniam facit uel cum conuicio iocatur*, according to Landgraf. Also V 174, 38 there are two glosses, viz. *caluentes frustrantes* and *cauillantes calumniantes*, cf. V 52, 7.

culatur, and this latter is also the prototype of what we find V 273, 48; IV 363, 45; Corp. Gloss. C 248. *Manticlatur*, written ^{ti}*mandatur*, may well account for *mandatur*, inasmuch as the scribe may have overlooked the superscribed *ti*; another one may have misread it for *r* and inserted it in the wrong place, whence resulted *mandratur*, and from that, by the dropping of the last syllable, may have sprung *mandrat* on the one hand and, through metathesis, *dramatur* on the other hand. But, as *dragmatur*, and not *dramatur*, is the reading of V 274, 48, how is the appearance of the *g* to be accounted for? I think, in the same way as the appearance of *c* V 318, 47 in *facta* = *fata* or of the *c* in the English word *scythe* or *scent*; that is to say, *g* being silent before *m*¹ as *c* before *t*² at the time the scribe wrote, it was unconsciously put, even where it properly had no right of being. Just so we find *g* superfluously and wrongly prefixed to *n* in II 493, 16 *gnatis* γλουτος (while III 493, 46 there is the right *natis* γλουτος), no doubt because the glossator had in mind *gnatus* = *natus*.

A clear case of metathesis is V 274, 27 *cabillatur cum derisione dolatur uel calumnias faciens*. This is evidently fashioned after such glosses as V 273, 57 *cabillatur cumconuicio locatur*; V 273, 56 *capillus locus cumconuicino*. These, of course, stand for *cauillatus cum conuicio iocatus* and *cauillus iocus cum conuicio*. *Dolatur* in V 274, 27 is, no doubt, metathesis of *lodatur*, i. e. *lotatur*, *locatur* = *iocatur* = *iocatus*, so that the true reading is *cauillatus cum derisione iocatus uel calumnias faciens*. IV 327, 47 we read *deculate decurbate*, which reappears inverted as *decurbate deculate* IV 327, 49. Loewe (Gloss. Nom., p. 107) doubtfully suggested to read *deculiatae decurtatae*, but did not feel satisfied with it, after all; he was sure, however, that the emendation of this gloss had to go hand in hand with that of *foliatum curuatum*, which we read IV 77, 45; 239, 43; 348, 8; 519, 44; V 201, 1; 259, 59 (*foleatum curbatum*); 361, 43 *feliatum* (Epinal, *foliatum*) *curbatum*; V 457, 34; 501, 33. Corpus Gloss. F 276 *foliatum curbutum*.

Now, as to *deculate decurbate*, we need only remember how often *o* and *u* are interchanged to see that *deculate* stands for *decolate*. The word is on record V 60, 27 *defecare est decollare*

¹ Cf. *pigmentum* and French *piment*.

² Cf. Codex Bezae, Acts 20, 31 *noïte*, where the dot over *c* seems to indicate that *c* is not sounded.

(= *decolare*) et res *condam* (= *quondam*) *mixtam* (= *mixtas*) a *fecibus segregari* (= *segregare*) = Placid. Gloss., ed. Deuerling, 35, 18, and C. Gl. L. V 283, 51 *desectum*¹ (= *defecatum*) *decolatum*. Comparing therewith V 285, 21 *defecatum afece* (= a *faece*) *purgatum*, and with that V 283, 45 *deffecatam purificatum* = *defaecatum purificatum*; V 356, 5 *defecatum uinum purificatum*, it becomes probable that owing to metathesis *decurbate* stands for *deburcate*, i. e. *depurgate*, so that the original was *decolate depurgate*. And so also *foliatum curuatum* may stand for original *foliatum purgatum*; this seems the more probable, as there is preceding IV 519, 43 *frondatur purgatur* and 344, 7 *folia frondens* (= *frondes*), wherewith compare V 501, 50 *frodatur* (= *frondatur*) *philloscopus* = *phyllocopus*; V 501, 51 *frondatur purgatur* and V 479, 54 *retanda* (= *resecanda*) *purganda* (cf. IV 79, 63 *fundatur* = *frondatur* (?) *putatur*). We have then to assume that there was a *foliare* in the sense of *defoliare*, which occurs V 618, 39 *defolio folia carpo*.² However, we meet in the Wright-Wülker glosses, W.-W. 409, 8, with a *folialis* explained *crompeht*, which seems to confirm *foliatum* = *curuatum*. May be, then, that we have to read *falcatum curuatum* and *falcalis crompeht*, if that is not rather *falcatis*; *falcatus* is a Virgilian word occurring Aen. VII 732 *falcati comminus enses*. About the interchange of *a* and *o* cf. C. Gl. L. IV 165, 38 *rudentes funes uelarum* = *uelorum*; as to *i(e)* appearing for *t* cf. C. Gl. L. V 319, 39 *peltaria pellesque amento bouis pendent* = IV 552, 39 = Corpus Gloss. P 276 (*pelltaria*) = *palearia pelles quae a mento bouis pendent* (cf. C. Gl. L. V 318, 48 *palearia caro quod submento bouis pendet*); Corpus Gloss. E 479 *exparia partibus* (= *partubus*) *uacuans* = E 480 *exparta parte* (i. e. *partu*) *uacua* = C. Gl. L. IV 68, 34.

C. Gl. L. V 303, 35 we have that puzzling gloss *inoliuae coesae*, but it will become intelligible if we apply the principle of metathesis; we get then *in liuoe* (= *liuore*) *caesae*, which may be what has been left of an original *in liuore uirgae id est in macula*³ *caesae*; cf. C. Gl. L. IV 192, 21 *uibifices* = *uibices cese* (= *caesae*) *plagarum*; IV 193, 1 *uibex plaga ex uirga* = V 336, 8; 33

¹ Cf. C. Gl. L. V 641, 71 *flores secas uini* = *fraces feces uini*.

² Cf. Lessing's *beblatten* = to remove superfluous leaves: "Höchstens . . . ihr Aufkeimen begünstigen, ihre Pflanzen versetzen, begüten, *beblatten*—kann hier entgegenarbeiten heissen" (Philos. Gespräche, Ernst and Falk, I).

³ Corpus Gloss. L 189 *libor. macula corporis*.

uibices plage in corpore sine sanguinem; V 253, 23 *uiiices* (= *uibices*) *caese plagarum*. Metathesis has very probably also been at work to produce IV 192, 19 *uiiux pugna*, which I think sprang from *uibex plaga*. So, too, V 554, 20 *lucar lucaris genus auis quę pulcre canit primo mane quando lux emanat deriuatur autem aluce seu pecunia¹ exlucis collecta*. Comparing V 572, 11 *lucisna auis quę bene cantat*, it becomes probable that the original *luscinia*, through metathesis, had turned into *lucisma*, *lucisna* and (perhaps through the medium of *lucinas luciras*) into *lucaris*. Hence the confusion of it with the genitive of *lucar* in V 554, 20. For I cannot persuade myself that there was an actual *lucar* = *luscinia*, as the glossator would have us believe it; nor that there was a by-form *lucisna*, as Landgraf (*Archiv f. Lat. Lex.* IX³ 392) seems to be inclined to think. But cf. Corp. F 190.

We know that by the Romans the honorary title of *amicus* was conferred upon states and tribes which they wished to keep on good terms with, but there is no record of a verb *amicare* expressive of this action; C. Gl. L. IV 239, 31, however, we read *foederati amicati*.

The adjective *passivus* has passed into the English language with the fixed meaning of 'passive,' i. e. inactive; the glosses, however, record it in the sense of 'passionate, hot-headed,' 'bold'; so IV 153, 33 *praecebs passibus uel temerarius* = IV 551, 20 *praeceps passiuus uel temerarius*.² Through the medium of *pacsibus* this *passiuus* appears, owing to metathesis, changed to *capsibus*: V 322, 60 *preceps temerarius capsibus*³; and in the sense of 'expansive, spacious' it appears in the Wright-Wülker glosses: W.-W. 514, 29 *passiua sio wide*; 464, 7 *passiuus sio widgille*; 453, 31 *non ut passiuus nales swa wide* = 486, 8. This *passiuus* is apparently an adjective formed from the past participle of *pandere*. Cf. Ahd. Gl. II 332, 8.

We know of a *latex* = *aqua*, but the glosses record another *latex* that seems to mean 'runner, clasper, tendril, side-shoot of a vine': C. Gl. L. IV 316, 29 *caprioli botrionis latices sunt*; IV 314, 35 *botriones latrices*; IV 594, 7 *botryones latices*; IV 359, 35 *latix aqua liquor uel palans racemus*. Should the real form of the word be *tradux*, corrupted by metathesis to *latrex*, and later *latex*, as indicated by IV 594, 7 when compared with IV 572, 27

¹ C. Gl. L. IV 110, 43 *lucar erogatio quę solebat in locis* (i. e. *lucis*) *fieri*; IV 111, 1 *lucra uectigalia* (= *lucar u.*).

² Cf. IV 396, 26 *temere sine consilio passiue uiolenter*.

³ Cf. III 333, 72 *ατακτος inmoderatus*; 73 *ατακτος passibus*.

tradix propago uel radix uel origo? Also Scaliger exhibits the word among his collection of noteworthy glosses = C. Gl. L. V 592, 2 *botriones latices*.

Among the Glossae Scaligeri there is also one the mystery of which Loewe, Prodrum, p. 58, despaired of being able to dissolve. It is found C. Gl. L. V 592, 68 and reads this way: *baen est lamina auri ab aure ad aurem quo familiares regum utebantur. Ornamentum colli ex auro et gemmis quod alio nomine torques potest dici.* Loewe has this to say on it: "Scaliger . . . unde hauserit nescio. Idem vocabulum in breuiloquo exstat, quem cum inspicere non possim ex Arevalo locum depromo: 'bahen graece, corona latine dicitur,' item in glossario Diefenbachii, p. 65 c, '*baen bahen bachē ben*' fere scribitur atque 'ornamentum colli,' '*halspant*,' aliter explicatur. Ianssonio ab Almelooven 'Saxonicum' videtur sapere coll. Spelmanni Archaiolog. v. 'beonomagium,' Vulcanio, p. 93, 51, contra Hispanicum: 'forte *barra*, ita enim hodie Hispanis vocatur lamina uel massa et discus.'"

In the glossaries I have found the following references to the word: C. Gl. L. III 510, 56 *baen bradium*¹ uel corona; III 490, 38 *baen corona*. The source of Scaliger's quotation is the Cod. Vatic. Reg. Christ. 215 = C. Gl. L. V 583, 10 *baen ornamentum colli est ex auro et gemmis pretiosissimum quod alio nomine torques potest dici quidam tamen dicunt ornamentum esse capitis*. I have also succeeded in finding the passage from which the word is evidently taken: it is I Maccab. 13, 37 *coronam auream et bahem quam misistis suscepimus*, which in the Septuagint reads τὸν στέφανον τὸν χρυσοῦν καὶ τὴν βάλιν [var. γ. βαίνην] ἣν ἀπεστείλατε κεκομίσμεθα. Apparently the same word is what we find I Maccab. 13, 51 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς αὐτὴν . . . μετὰ αἰνέσεως καὶ βαίων καὶ ἐν κινύραις καὶ ἐν κυμβίοις καὶ ἐν νάβλοις καὶ ἐν ὕμνοις καὶ ἐν ψαλμοῖς and John 12, 13 ἔλαβον τὰ βάλια τῶν φοινίκων. An unknown translator has also made use of the word in Lev. 23, 40, putting βάλια φοινίκων where the Septuagint version has κάλλυνθρα φοινίκων. In all these passages the meaning is clearly 'branches of palm trees,' 'bays,' and in that sense Luther took it in I Maccab. 13, 37, and so translated "die güldene Krone sammt den Palmen," while the Catholic version has "die güldene Krone sammt dem Halsband," no doubt following the lead of the Latin interpretation in vogue that took it in the sense of *torques*. As to the origin of the word,

¹ = *brabium*; cf. IV 25, 6 *bradium premium uel palma*.

Grimm and others consider it to be a Macedonian word, while some English scholars would derive it from the Egyptian.

New words are hidden away in these glosses. A formation similar to that of *pestinuntius*, quoted by Landgraf from V 320, 21; 385, 26; 607, 1, is *turpinuntius*, occurring IV 127, 16 *nugii gerulus uel turpinuntius*.

moralia in the sense of 'morals' we meet with IV 56, 44 *discolis mortalibus uel difficilioribus*, which is *dyscolus uel moralibus difficilioribus* = stern or of somewhat strict morals.

A perfect puzzle is *hordo* in the gloss IV 89, 52 *indago hordo*; but if we restore the proper order of letters, we get the quite intelligible interpretation *odor* that well fits to *indago*, although *odor* would then stand in the somewhat pregnant meaning of 'tracking by scent.' It is, however, possible that we have to do here with the verb *indago*; then *odor* is mutilated from *odoro*. V 7, 25 is also disfigured and unintelligible, owing to the ravages of metathesis; for *asisua petauro pernice* we have to read *fauissa thesaurus persice* or, rather, [*gaza*] *fauissa thesaurus persice*, as will become plain from a comparison of V 641, 58 with IV 596, 2 and V 299, 26, IV 85, 10, IV 523, 20; cp. also V 22, 1 with II 568, 23.

We know of a *diluerē* = ^{dilute} dissolve, but if we are to believe IV 56, 5 it meant also to 'fight for, defend.' However, we owe this new meaning simply to metathesis, and so have to restore *diluit purgat def(a)eculat*; cf. IV 54, 28 *diluit purgat defendit* = *defeculat*.

punire = to kill.

In the Sangallensis 912 (ed. M. Warren), P 502 = C. Gl. L. IV 276, 8, we read *puniatur uccitatur*. Warren sees in *uccitatur* a corruption of *occidatur*, and his conjecture is borne out by such glosses as C. Gl. L. IV 102, 49 *iugulare punire*; C. Gl. L. IV 144, 14 *plectitur decollatur* = 549, 50; 144, 15 *plectere punire* = V 321, 34; 382, 46 *punitur percutitur plectitur*; Corpus Glossary (ed. Hessels), T 273 *tropea spolia punitorum*; cf. C. Gl. L. IV 287, 29 *spolia quę occiso hoste tollitur*. There also probably belongs C. Gl. L. IV 382, 44 *punit indicat*, where *indicat* is corrupted from *uindicat*, i. e. *uendicat* = takes revenge by killing¹;

¹C. Gl. L. V 478, 28 *ponire bucinare* seems to belong here, too, if *ponire* is = *punire*; *bucinare* is then probably corrupted from **bucillare* = *bucellare* 'to cut to pieces'—or is it = *lancinare*? cf. C. Gl. L. IV 104, 4 *lancinat bellicat* (= *uellicat*) *trucidat*.

cf. IV 147, 10 *poenita uindicta*. From these glosses it becomes then evident that *punire* was used to denote 'punishing by taking one's life = to execute, to kill,' and in that sense it is applied in the Vulgate, II Macc. 7, 7 *interrogabant si manducaret prius quam toto corpore per membra singula puniretur*.

From C. Gl. L. IV 105, 23 *laccessunt interitant*, it would seem that we are confronted with a new verb *interitare*, apparently formed from *interitus*, and so meaning to 'work ruin, destruction'; the assumption of such a verb interpreting *laccessere* would seem to be corroborated by C. Gl. L. IV 104, 9 *lancinauerunt laccesserunt* when compared with C. Gl. L. IV 104, 4 *lancinat bellicat uel trucidat* or C. Gl. L. IV 104, 18 *laccessire iniuriare*; we would then have to assume that *laccessere* could mean not only 'to tease, to bodily injure,' but 'to so injure anybody as to bring about his death.' However, I think we need not go to that length in order to arrive at a proper understanding of the gloss in question. I believe *laccesserunt* IV 104, 9 is = *laccerauerunt*, and the *r* in *interitant* is a misreading of *n*, and so the word is *intenant*, i. e. *intentant* = they threaten,¹ provoke, irritate.

French *gâteau*, according to current opinion (Körting, No. 8870), owes its origin to MHG. *wastel*; but that the word, if of Germanic origin, must have entered into French before the MHG. period, the following gloss of the Cassinensis 90 (10th century) seems to prove: *pulturnum seu pullarium genus tenebrici uasculi* (C. Gl. L. V 577, 12); that is, *p. s. p.* 'a sort of bran cake.' That *uasculi* stands for *uastuli* seems to be confirmed by what we read in the Vaticanus 1468 (10th century): *pullernum seu pullarium genus tenebrici uastuli*. This, to be sure, is a gloss added by a later hand (probably of the 13th century), but, nevertheless, goes to show that *uastuli* is the right form.

Landgraf (Archiv f. Lat. Lex. IX³ 384) quotes from C. Gl. L. IV 270, 1 and V 509, 41 *pecudarius* = pastor as a word hitherto not known. But already Loewe (Gloss. Nom., etc., p. 168) cites a *pecudarius* among his new words rescued from the glossaries, and that seems to be the proper form.

¹ IV 251, 38 *intentant intendunt minatur* = *minantur*; or does it stand for *increpitant*, II 312, 63?

Schimmel.

According to what Kluge says under 'Schimmel,' it would seem as if the word is not on record in OHG., and had to be inferred from the adjective *scimbalag*. However, we find Ahd. Gl. I 431, 27 *erugo sc'imbli*; I 366, 18 *rubigine idē sci'mbal*; II 548, 51 *erugine scimbile*.

Schminke.

I think the etymon of this word is to be found in *σμίγμα*; cf. C. Gl. L. V 578, 50 *segmigma* (= ^{eg}*smigma*) *unctio quam nobiles componunt feminae ad uultus pulciores reddendos*; V 513, 32 *segmina (smigma) uncto (= unctio) quam componunt feminae propter pulcritudinem uultus*. *Schminke* sprang from that through metathesis.

gisuetit.

I have in vain looked for a trace of this word in Sweet's glossary to his Oldest E. T. The word is on record in Erfurt³ (= Gloss. Nom. 768) *ferruminatus gisuetit*; as we have in the Cyrillus Glossary *χαλκοκολλητος ferruminatus*, it would seem probable that *gisuetit* is = German *geschweisst* (= *zusammen geschweisst*).

frangat = framigað?

There is a very strange gloss in the Corpus N 34 *nauat frangat*; if *frangat* is Latin, it certainly is the strangest explanation of *nauat*; but I think *frangat* is A.-S. for *framigað*; cf. W.-W. 100, 8 *prosit framige*; 465, 10 *pubescens weaxendo forðframiende*.

broth.

The first instance of this word occurring in English literature belongs to the year 1000, according to Murray's New English Dictionary. However, if I am not mistaken, there is a much earlier instance on record. For in the Corpus Glossary U 208 we have *uiscellum broht*; that is, *iuscellum broth*. (In the same way V 655, 13 *Iuscellum* has been put for *uiscellum*, as pointed out by W. Heraeus (Archiv f. L. L. IX⁴ 594).) That this early instance of *broth* has escaped Murray's notice is, no doubt, due to Mr. Sweet having overlooked it. For I can find no trace of the word in his glossarial index, although the word is marked as Anglo-Saxon in his edition of the Corpus Glosses.

burhsteal.

From W.-W. 205, 36 *cliuium i. discensum helde burhsteal* it would seem that there is a compound *burh-steal* = steep descent. However, I have no manner of doubt that the gloss refers to I Reg. 9, 11 of the Vulgate: *cumque ascenderent* CLIVUM CIVITATIS, and *burh steal* is = *burh stegal*, a rendering of the last two words 'the hill on which the town stands,' or 'the rising ground on which the town stands.' Cf. Ahd. Gl. I 392, 32.

HARTFORD HIGH SCHOOL.

OTTO B. SCHLUTTER.